obtaining records from his state court criminal proceedings and not at obtaining relief from his current confinement. Accordingly, on October 25, 2006, this Court issued an Order declining to serve petitioner's petition or to direct that an answer be filed. (Dkt. No. 8.) In that Order, the Court advised petitioner that if his intent was to seek relief from his current confinement, he must clearly identify the federal constitutional grounds which entitled him to such relief, and he must demonstrate that any such grounds had been properly exhausted in the state courts. (*Id.*)

On November 8, 2006, petitioner filed an amended petition for writ of habeas corpus. (Dkt. No. 9.) In that petition, petitioner asserts that he is not challenging any judgment of conviction and that he was convicted of no crime. These assertions appear to be based upon petitioner's belief that he is currently serving a sentence for a case which was dismissed. The documents which petitioner provides in support of his petition clearly refute that notion.

Moreover, the claims which petitioner raises specifically challenge only a search warrant issued by the King County Superior Court and executed by a City of Seattle Police Detective. While it appears from the record that petitioner presented some form of Fourth Amendment challenge to the Washington Court of Appeals, it is not clear that petitioner presented the precise claims to that court as are presented here, nor is there any indication that petitioner sought review of any of his Fourth Amendment claims in the Washington Supreme Court.1

Because petitioner's assertion that he is currently serving a sentence for a case which was dismissed is clearly without merit, and because petitioner fails to demonstrate that any of his

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

¹ The Court further notes that Fourth Amendment claims are not cognizable in a federal habeas proceeding if a petitioner has had a full and fair opportunity to litigate the claims in state 22 court. Stone v. Powell, 428 U.S. 465, 481-82 (1976). The relevant inquiry is whether the petitioner was afforded a full and fair hearing, not whether the state court reached a correct resolution. See 23 Siripongs v. Calderon, 35 F.3d 1308, 1321 (9th Cir. 1994)(defendant had a full and fair opportunity where he made his Fourth Amendment argument in both state trial and appellate courts), cert. denied,

^{24 115} S.Ct. 1175 (1995). Nothing in the record suggests that petitioner was denied the opportunity to litigate his Fourth Amendment claims in the state courts.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Case 2:06-cv-01334-MJP Document 13 Filed 01/22/07 Page 3 of 3

intended claims have been properly exhausted in the state courts, this Court recommends that petitioner's amended federal habeas petition and this action be dismissed without prejudice. A proposed order accompanies this Report and Recommendation. DATED this 22nd day of January, 2007. United States Magistrate Judge REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

PAGE - 3